

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 7, 2008. After its entry, claims 1 and 4-27 are currently pending in this application and subject to examination. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 3. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Specification and Drawing(s) Objection

In the October 7, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner objected to the present specification and to one or more drawings. *See* Office Action Summary. Regarding the drawings objection, the Examiner asserts that “the drawings” do not show every feature specified in the claims, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). However, Applicants note that no drawings were filed in the present application. The Examiner and the undersigned discussed this objection in a phone interview on January 7, 2008. The Examiner clarified that her objection was intended to require the Applicants to submit one or more drawings that show all of the features (*i.e.*, layers) of the claimed organic electroluminescent devices. To satisfy this requirement, Applicants intend draft such drawings and submit them to the Examiner as soon as possible. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Examiner did not provide any grounds for the specification objection. Since the Examiner has provided no reason for her objection and Applicants believe that the present specification is not in any way deficient, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0106006 A1 to Eriyama et al. (Eriyama). This rejection is moot as to claims 2 and 3, which are cancelled. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as to claims 1, 4-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27.

Claim 1, as amended, now recites:

“[O]rganic electroluminescent device comprising an anode, a cathode and at least one emission layer comprising at least one matrix material which is doped with at least one phosphorescent emitter, characterised in that the emission layer on the anode side is directly adjacent to an electrically conductive layer, *wherein both said at least one matrix material and said at least one phosphorescent emitter are low-molecular-weight defined compounds having a molecular weight of less than 10,000 g/mol.*”

(emphasis added) Amended claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, that the emission layer (1) on the anode side be directly adjacent to an electrically conductive layer and (2) comprise a matrix material doped with a phosphorescent emitter, wherein both the matrix material and the phosphorescent emitter are low-molecular-weight defined compounds having a molecular weight of less than 10,000 g/mol.

In contrast, Eriyama does not disclose these features. In Figure 1 of Eriyama, an anode (2) and a luminescent layer (5) are depicted. Between these two layers are a hole-transporting layer (3) and a copper phthalocyanine layer (4). The hole-transporting and copper phthalocyanine layers are directly adjacent to each other with the hole-transporting layer directly adjacent to the anode and the copper phthalocyanine layer directly adjacent to the luminescent layer. A copper phthalocyanine layer is only deemed to be an “electrically conductive layer” *when it is directly adjacent to an anode*. See page 4, line 11 to page 5, line 15 of the present specification. As such, while the luminescent layer (5) of Eriyama is directly adjacent to the copper phthalocyanine layer (4), it is not “directly adjacent to an electrically conductive layer,” as required by claim 1, since the copper phthalocyanine layer (4) is not directly adjacent to the anode (2). Furthermore, contrary to Examiner’s assertion, Eriyama does not disclose that its luminescent layer (5) comprises a matrix material doped with a phosphorescent emitter and, by extension, Eriyama also cannot disclose such a layer where both the matrix material and the phosphorescent emitter have a molecular weight of less than 10,000 g/mol.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP 2131, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed.

Cir. 1987). Since Eriyama neither explicitly nor inherently teaches each and every limitation of amended claim 1, claim 1 is novel and patentable over Eriyama. Furthermore, since claims 4-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, these claims are likewise novel and patentable over Eriyama. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11, 14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as rendered obvious by Eriyama in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0096138 A1 to Lecloux et al. (Lecloux). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants incorporate herein by reference the remarks *supra* regarding claims 1, 4-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27. As with establishing anticipation, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See MPEP § 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)). The combined teachings of Eriyama and Lecloux neither teach nor suggest an emission layer that (1) is directly adjacent to an electrically conductive layer on the anode side or (2) comprises a matrix material doped with a phosphorescent emitter, wherein both the matrix material and the phosphorescent emitter are low-molecular-weight defined compounds having a molecular weight of less than 10,000 g/mol. The combined teachings of these references fail to render claim 1 obvious since they neither teach nor suggest all of its limitations. As such, the combined teachings of these references also fail to render claims 11, 14, and 16 obvious, since these claims depend directly from claim 1, which is deemed non-obvious and patentable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this amendment. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14113-00010-US, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Eamonn P. Morrison/
Eamonn P. Morrison
Registration No.: 55,841
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant